

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 21 2010

CASE NO.: 50T5561.01
Serial No.: 10/666,724
October 21, 2010
Page 8PATENT
Filed: September 19, 2003

Remarks

Indefiniteness Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for being indefinite. The amendment to Claim 15 advanced herein cures its rejection. With respect to the comment that Claim 1 is indefinite because it recites that displayer control signals are multiplexed with the multimedia data on the primary link and, per the examiner, "multimedia data is transmitted from the source to the player while the displayer control signals are transmitted from the displayer to the source", note that the specification, page 7, last line continuing to page 8 teaches that control information can be multiplexed in the data sent from the source to the player to control the player. Note further that page 8, lines 3-8 teaches that the primary link may be a full duplex link in which the player can send back control signals to the source. In any case, the specification teaches, and Claim 1 recites, that displayer control signals may be sent on the primary link and in some cases may be multiplexed in with the multimedia data. There being no other rejections levied against independent Claims 1 and 7, they and their dependent claims are patentable.

Obviousness Rejections

a. Independent Claim 17 and dependent Claims 18, 22, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, USPP 2003/0117587 in view of Nesic, USPN 6,593,895 and Ishimaru, JP 2000-307494.

b. Independent Claim 31 and dependent Claims 32-34 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson in view of Chang, USPP 2003/0183003, Nesic, and Saints, USPN 6,374,085.

1168-98.AMS

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 21 2010

CASE NO.: 50T5561.01

Serial No.: 10/666,724

October 21, 2010

Page 9

PATENT

Filed: September 19, 2003

c. Dependent Claims 36 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, Saints, and Edenson, USPN 7,006,995.

d. Dependent Claim 37 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, Saints, and Koyama, USPP 2002/0159035.

e. Dependent Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson in view of Nesic, Ishimaru, and Rao, USPN 5,881,074.

f. Dependent Claim 35 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, Saints, and Rao.

g. Independent Claim 9 and dependent Claims 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Olson, Chang, Nesic, and Yanagihara, USPN 5,712,946.

Obviousness Rejections

Independent Claims 9 and 17

Claim 9 has been amended by incorporating the beam control feature of now-canceled Claim 16. As set forth by Claim 17 for example, capability signals are sent from the receiver to the means for wirelessly transmitting to cause the means for wirelessly transmitting to adjust a directivity of an antenna beam transmitted by the means for wirelessly transmitting. This has been rejected on the basis of Ishimaru, but in Ishimaru, as best understood by Applicant, the relied-upon signals are not sent from the receiver to the source but rather from a separate remote control 110. Ishimaru does not suggest moving the function of the RC 110 into the receiver nor is there any reason to do on the basis of the other references, which do not contemplate the recited antenna beam directivity in the claims. These claims and their dependent claims are now patentable.

1168-98.AMS

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 21 2010

CASE NO.: 50T5561.01
Serial No.: 10/666,724
October 21, 2010
Page 10

PATENT
Filed: September 19, 2003

Independent Claim 31

Claim 31 has been rejected on the basis of Saints' power control signals, but Claim 31 does not recite power control. Instead, Claim 31 recites control signals that are useful for establishing a source *antenna beam form control*, a concept not addressed, to the best of Applicant's belief, in the relied-upon references. Claim 31 appears to be patentable. In other words, power control refers to the power that the source is to use, and is a different concept than the claimed beam form control. Apples and oranges.

Respectfully submitted,

/John L. Rogitz/

John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1168-98.AM5